Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
07-209 JUN 22 2007
OFFICE OF THE CLERK

2007

In The

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

PO KEE WONG, Pro Se – PETITIONER

VS

BOSTON RETIRMENT BOARD
MA SC No. SJC 09858

Petition for a Writ of Certiorari to Supreme Judicial Court for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts in re: Case No.SJ-2006-0041and Case No.02-3854-F at Suffolk Superior Court According to U.S. Federal Supreme Court Rule 13. 1. and Rule 13.3

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

On August 17 , 2007
Submitted by
PO KEE WONG, Pro Se-PETITIONER
2413 Spencer Road, Silver, Maryland 20910-2344
Tel: 301-585-3453; e-MAIL:
POKWONG@VERIZON.NET

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

I. In a case of city-employee retirement, the City Retirement Board Counsel may have been construed in violation **of U.S.C. 18 Section 2071 of intentional/or unintentional concealment of admissible judicial evidences**. Should the City of Boston Retirement Board Counsel be allowed to practice the act of obstruction of judicial justice?

II. Should all U.S. government officials, including but not limiting to judges, be given the unlimited power to cover up and rule against a case that may be construed **in violation of U.S.C. 18 Section 2071?**

III. According to **U.S.C. 1251**, should the U.S. Supreme Court allow anyone in the U.S. Government and/ or anyone else in the world to rule against a case that may be construed **in violation of U.S.C. 18 Section 2071?**

PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDINGS

The only parties to the proceedings are those listed in the caption of the case.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page
QUESTION PRESENTED.....i.
PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDINGS..... ii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....ii
APPENDICES.....iii
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES.....iv
OPINIONS BELOW.....1
JURISDICTION.....2
RELEVANT PROVISIONS INVOVLED.....2
STATEMENT OF THE CASE.....3
REASONS GRANTING THE PETITION.....3
TYPE OF RELIEF BEING SOUGHT.....6
CONCLUSION.....7
APENDICES.....1a to 20a
ORDERS FROM STATE COURTS..... 1a to3a
APPEAL TO CASE SJ-2006-0041.....4a to 11a
APPEAL TO CASE 02-3854-F.....12a to 15a
SUMMARY OF SYSTEMS RESEARCH CO....16a to 20a

APPENDICES Page

SUPREME COURT **ORDER** No. SJC-09858..... 1a

SINGLE JUSTICE **ORDER** No.SJ-2006-0041.....2a

SINGLE JUSTICE **JUDGMENT** No. SJ-2006-0041.....3a

DENIAL OF PETITION FOR REHAERING.....4a

JUDGMENT AFTER RESCRIPT.....5a

NOTICE OF DOCKET ENTRY.....6a

PLEADING FOR RE-CONSIDERATION.....7a

PLEADING ON JANUARY 21, 2005 JUDGMENT....12a

SYSTEMS RESEARCH COMPANY.....16a to 20a

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page

Cases

Supreme Judicial Court No. SJC-09858 1

Mass. Single Justice Case No. SJ-2006-0041..... 1

Suffolk Superior Court Case No. 02-3854-F.....1

Statutes

18 U.S.C. Section 2071 .....i ; 2;4

1251 U.S.C.....i

Rules

Federal Supreme Court Rule13.3 and Rule 13.3 Cover

Other Authorities:

General Laws of Massachusetts, Chapter 32. Retirement Systems and Pension

- **Section 4-(1)-(d)**
- **Section 4-(10-(f)**
- **Section 4-(1)-(f%1/2%)**
- **Section 3-(4)**
- **Section 3-(4A)**
- **Section 4-(1)-(p)**
- **all from.....page 6 to 7**

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

According to the U.S. Supreme Court **Rule 13. Review on Certiorari and the Rule 14. Content of Petition for a Writ of Certiorari,**. Pro Se PETITIONER Po Kee Wong respectfully prays that **a Review on Certiorari** can be issued to review the judgment from the Massachusetts state courts below:

OPINIONS BELOW

The opinions of the Massachusetts State Courts are summarized below:

The ORDER from the Supreme Judicial Court for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, No. SJC-09858 was issued on February 13, 2007.

The ORDER from the Supreme Judicial Court for Suffolk County case No. SJ-2006-0041was issued on October 10, 2006.

The JUDGMENT from the Supreme Judicial Court for Suffolk County case No, SJ-2006-0041 was issued on June 28, 2006

The opinions of the Case No. SJ-2006-0041 from the Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court and the Case No. 02-3854-F from the Massachusetts Sulffolk Superior Court of Appeals that appear at Appendices page 4a to page 15a

JURISDICTION

The opinions from all the Massachusetts States Courts have been continuously appealed and timely filed step by step based on the their judgments may be in violation of the U.S.C. 18 Section 2071 .The final ORDER for the Case SJC-09858 was issued on April 2, 2007 by the Massachusetts State Supreme Court. The ORDER was immediately appealed in time by Pro Se Petitioner Po Kee Wong to U.S. Federal Supreme Court started from April 21, 2007 and had been received and replied by the Clerk's Office of the U.S. Federal Supreme Court on April 26, 2007 letter signed by Erik Fossum.

RELEVANT PROVISIONS INVOLVED

The most important element of this retirement case was started from the beginning with the false statements presented by the Counsel of Boston Retirement Board to the division of administrative law appeals, as a result of those false statements having been made and therefore leading from thereafter, the wrong judgments from Massachusetts Courts of various levels. The subsequent proof can be evident from the clerks of various levels that the original documents had been submitted in time and very well docketed in the relevant offices and courts where the documents had been and should be submitted to. Based on the provision of U.S.C 18 Section 2071 (a) and (b) that are quoted in the REASONS GRANTING THE PETITION shown below, the case should be well considered and granted by the U.S. Supreme Court .

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Res[illegible]ling to the promotion for earlier retirement prog[illegible] in the city of Boston in 2001, teachers of Boston Public Schools are encouraged and allowed to buy their retirement according to the State Retirement Law.
When the Pro Se Petitioner Po Kee Wong had submitted all the required documents in time to the Retirement Board, the counsel of the Retirement Board chose not to believe the authenticity of all documents having been submitted to her and started to make false statements to the Division of Administrative Law Appeals (DALA) about the submitted documents. As a result, the case is continuously appealed up to all Massachusetts State Courts and now to the U.S. Federal Supreme Court.

REASONS GRANTING THE PETITION

The U.S. Supreme Court should grant this petition for a Writ of Certiorari based on the U.S. Supreme Court Rules 13.1 and 13.3 to support the following reasons I.; II. III in answer to the three questions presented:

I. U.S.C. 18 Section 2071 provides:
Concealment, removal, or mutilation generally
(a) Whoever willfully and unlawfully conceals, removes, obliterates, or destroys, or attempts to do so, or, with intent to do so takes and carries away any record, proceeding, map, book, paper, document, or other thing, filed or deposited with...any public office, or with any...public officer of the United States, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than three years, or both.

(b) Whoever, having the custody of any such record, proceeding, map, book, document, paper, or other thing, willfully and unlawfully conceals, removes, mutilates, obliterates, falsifies, or destroys the same, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than three years; and shall forfeit his office and be disqualified from holding any office under the United States.

According to all the actual documents of evidences that had been submitted to the courts of various levels in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, the Board Counsel of Boston Retirement Board may have been construed in violation of the above listed U.S.C.18 Section 2071.

Therefore, the U.S. Supreme Court should grant this PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI to stop all U.S. government officials of all levels from practicing the violation of U.S.C. 18 Section 2071.

II. **The U.S. Supreme Court should grant this PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI of this case by:**

Subpoena of the written record for Judge Walker's NOTICE TO APPEAR FOR FINAL PRE-TRIAL CONFERENCE together with the audio record taped in the Court Room on 01/20/2005.

Please listen carefully to the dialogues among Judge Muse;

Edward H. McKenna, Boston Retirement Board Lawyer and Po Kee Wong, the Pro Se petitioner.

After Po Kee Wong's answering to Judge Grabau's question to buy back 9 years and 5 months in a previous hearing in the court room as allowed by the Massachusetts General Law for retirement, Po Kee Wong had finished and submitted the DOCUMENTS ONLY BY HIM IN TIME in response to and from Judge Walker's NOTICE on 01/20/2005. However, Judge Muse decided to issue the JUDGMENT of this public trial without jury of this Civil Case 02-3854-F in the Court Room of Suffolk Superior Court alone on the same day of 01/20/2005. The contents of our dialogues on 01/20/2005 were so "shocking" to Po Kee Wong inside the court room for almost 20 seconds to have made him speechless and that the contents of the dialogues should be sufficiently used to overturn the JUDGMENT issued by Judge Muse alone.

III. The U.S. Supreme Court should grant **THIS PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI ACCORDING TO U.S.C. 1251 NOT TO ALLOW ANYONE IN THE U.S. GOVERNMENT AND/OR ANYONE ELSE IN THE WORLD TO RULE AGAINST A CASE THAT MAY BE CONSTRUED IN VIOLATION OF U.S.C.18 SECTION 2071.**

IV. According to the General Laws of Massachusetts, Charter 32. Retirement Systems and Pension
*Section 4-(1)-(d), Po Kee Wong should be allowed to buy back his services at Stone and Webster Engineering Corporation from 1974 -1975 and for his services at Systems Research Company from 1976 to 2001 in the State of Massachusetts.

It is important for the court to issue an order to audit the account in the City of Boston that may be involved in Po Kee Wong's proposals having been submitted through Boston Public Schools as a collaboration partner to the various U.S. Federal Governmental Agencies from the period of September, 1979 to June, 2001.
*Section 4-(1)-(f) and Section 4-(1)-(f%1/2%p) for his services at University of Utah from 1959-1961; at California Institute of Technology from 1961-1965; at Stanford University from 1968-1970 and at Santa Clara University from January 4, 1971 to March 19, 1971.
*Section 3-(4);Section 3-(4A) and Section 4-(1)-(p) all combined to allow for purchasing back up to 10 years of Services outside of Boston Public Schools.

TYPE OF RELIEF BEING SOUGHT

Based on the history of employment of Pro Se Petitioner Po Kee Wong in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, he is entitled to seek the relief to buy back his retirement in two separate parts: Namely Part (1). and / or Part (2).

Part (1) is based on his previous employments with various educational institutions within USA. This has been claimed and should be allowed to buy back 9 years and 5 months but not more than 10 years according to the published Massachusetts State General Law.

Part (2) . is optional and it is involved in his operation of his own small business, SYSTEMS RESEARCH COMPANY that was founded by him in 1976 in the Town of Brookline before he joined the Boston Public Schools in 1979.
Some of his company proposals may have been used by the Boston Public Schools to have obtained U.S. Federal Government Contracts.

The Pro Se petitioner Po Kee Wong seeks the relief from the U.S. Federal Supreme Court to issue an order of:
(1). To allow Po Kee Wong to buy back his retirement for 9 year and 5 months from the City of Boston Retirement Board.
(2). To audit the City of Boston Account to determine whether SYSTEMS RESEARCH COMPANY'S proposals had been used by the Boston public Schools to have obtained the U.S. Federal Government Contracts.

CONCLUSION

Based on all the questions and reasons I.; II. ; III; IV together with all evidences in the submissions, this petition for a writ of certiorari to review a judgment by the state courts of Massachusetts according to U.S. Supreme Court Rule No. 13.1 and No.13.3 under the exceptional circumstances warrant the exercise of the U.S. Federal Supreme Court's discretionary powers to grant the relief for:

(1) Allowing Po Kee Wong to buy back 9 years and 5 months time according to the Massachusetts Retirement Law Section 3-(4); Section 3-(4A) and Section 4-(1)-(p).

(2) Auditing the account of the City of Boston specifically involved with the Po Kee Wong's proposals having been submitted to the various U.S. Federal governmental agencies for supports with collaborations of Boston public Schools as a proposal partner.

Respectfully submitted by,



Po Kee Wong, Pro Se Petitioner
2413 Spencer Road, Silver Spring, Maryland 20910-2344
Tel: 301-585-3453
E-mail: pokwong@verizon.net

APPENDICES

ORDER

Supreme Judicial Court

February 13, 2007

Po Kee Wong vs. Boston Retirement Board. February 13, 2007. *Supreme Judicial Court,* Appeal from order of single justice.

Po Kee Wong appeals from both a judgment of a single justice of this court denying his petition for relief pursuant to G.L. c. 211, s. 3, and the single justice's order denying his motion for reconsideration. We affirm.

Wong, a former Boston public school teacher, was denied certain employment credits by the Boston Retirement Board (board).Wong unsuccessfully challenged the board's decision before the division of administrative law appeals, the Contributory Retirement Appeal Board, and the Superior Court. He then sought to pursue an appeal in the Appeals Court but failed to timely docket the appeal. He moved for leave to docket the appeal late, but a single justice of the Appeals Court denied the motion. He then sought relief in the county court pursuant to G.L. c.211, s 3,apparently request either that the Appeals Court be required to grant him leave to docket his appeal late, or that the single justice entertain his appeal on the merits. The single justice denied his petition as well as his motion for reconsideration.

Wong then filed a notice of appeal "according to Rule 2:21." See S.J.C. Rule 2:21, as amended, 434 Mass. 1301 (2001). Although he is not challenging an interlocutory ruling of the trial court, and thus rule 2:21 technically does not apply. Wong cannot demonstrate that he lacked an adequate alternative to relief under G. L. c.211, s 3. He could have appealed to a panel of the Appeals Court from the decision of the single justice of that court denying his motion for leave to docket his appeal late. Se Maza v. Commonwealth, 423 Mass. 1006 (1966).

Judgment affirmed.
Order denying motion for Reconsideration affirmed.

The case was submitted on the papers filed, accompany by a memorandum of law.
Po Kee Wong, Pro Se.

SUPREME JUDICIAL COURT FOR SUUOLK COUNTY
No. SJ-2006-0041
Suffolk Superior Court
No. 02-3854-F

PO KEE WONG
Vs.
BOSTON RETIREMENT BOARD, ET AL

ORDER

This matter came before the Court, Sosman, J., presiding, on a request for reconsideration, and upon consideration thereof, it is ORDERED that the request be, and the same hereby is, denied.

By the Court (Sosman, J), MBS

Signature signed by

Maura S. Doyle, Clerk

ENTERED: October 10, 2006

SUPREME JUDICIAL COURT FOR SUFFOLK COUNTY
No. SJ-2006-0041
Suffolk Superior Court
No. 02-3854-F

PO KEE WONG
Vs.
BOSTON RETIREMENT BOARD, ET AL

JUDGMENT

This matter came before the Court, Sosman, J., presiding, on a petition pursuant to G.L. c. 211, s.3, and upon consideration thereof, it is ORDERED that the petition be, and the same hereby is, denied without hearing.

By the Court, (Sosman, J.) MBS
Signature signed by
Maura S. Doyle, Clerk

Entered: June 28, 2006

Supreme Judicial Court for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts
John Adams Courthouse
One Pemberton Square, Suite 1400, Boston, Massachusetts 02108-1724
Telephone 617-557-1020, Fax 617-557-1145

Po Kee Wong
2413 Spencer Road
Silver Spring, MD 20910

RE: No. SJC-09858

PO KEE WONG
VS.
BOSTON RETIREMENT BOARD

NOTICE OF DENIAL OF PETITION FOR REHAERING

The Petition for Rehearing filed in the above captioned case has been considered by the court and is denied.

Suan Mellen, Clerk

Dated : March 29, 2007

To: Po Kee Wong
Edward H. McKenna, Esquire

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS
Supreme Judicial Court
For Suffolk County
John Adams Courthouse
One Pemberton Square, Suite 1300
Boston, Massachusetts 02108-1707
Case Information 617-557-1100, Fax 617-557-1117

SUPREME JUDICIAL COURT FOR SUFFOLK COUNTY
No. SJ-2006-0041

Suffolk Superior Court
No. 02-3854-F

PO KEE WONG

VS.

BOSTON RETIREMENT BOARD, ET AL

JUDGMENT AFTER RESCRIPT

This matter came before the Court, and in accordance with the Rescript Opinion that was entered in the Full Court on February 13, 2007, it is ORDERED and ADJUDGED that the following entry of Judgment be, and the same hereby is, made:

"Judgment and Order denying motion for reconsideration affirmed."

By the Court, (Greaney, J.)
Signature signed by
Maura S. Doyle, Clerk

ENTERED: April 2, 2007

April 2, 2007

NOTICE OF DOCKET ENTRY

You are hereby notified that on April 2, 2007, the following was entered on the docket of the above referenced case:

JUDGMENT after Rescript from the SJC for the Commonwealth, "Judgment and Order denying motion for reconsideration affirmed." (Greaney, J)

Signature signed by
Maura S. Doyle, Clerk

To: Po Kee Wong
Edward H. McKenna, Esquire

Supreme Judicial Court for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts
John Adams Courthouse
One Pemberton Square, Suite 1400, Boston, Massachusetts 02108-1724
Telephone 617-557-1020, Fax 617-557-1145

Po Kee Wong
2413 Spencer Road
Silver Spring, MD 20910

RE: No. SJC-09858

PO KEE WONG
VS.
BOSTON RETIREMENT BOARD

NOTICE OF DENIAL OF PETITION FOR REHEARING

The Petition for rehearing filed in the above captioned case has been considered by the court and is denied.

Suan Mellen, Clerk

Dated: March 29, 2007

To: Po Kee Wong
Edward H. McKenna, Esquire

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS
SUPREME JUDICIAL COURT

CASE NO. SJ-2006-0041
PO KEE WONG
VS.
BOSTON RETIREMENT BOARD , ET AL
Suffolk Superior Court
Case No. 02-3854-F

PLEADING FOR RE-CONSIDERATION FROM THE June 28,2006 JUDGMENT issued by HONORABLE SUPREME JUDICIAL COURT JUSTICE Sosman, J. ACCORDING TO THE GENERAL LAWS OF MASSACHUSETTS PART III, TITLE I. CHAPTER 211 SECTION 3

SUBMITTED AND MAIL ON JULY 1, 2006 BY Po Kee Wong, Pro Se Plaintiff
2413 Spencer Road, Silver Spring, Maryland 20910-2344 USA
Tel: 301-585-3453
E-mail: pokwong@verizon.net

TO:

Maura S. Doyle, Clerk
Eric Wetzel, Assistant Clerk (Tel:617-557-1186)
Supreme Judicial Court for Sufforlk County
John Adams Courthouse, Suite 1300
Boston, Massachusetts 02108-1707

C.C.
Edward McKenna, Esq
Juliana deHaan Rice

Dear Honorable Supreme Justice Sosman:

This is pleading to you to reconsider your initial judgment of the case based on the following documents with facts that had been submitted and accepted for docketing by all three levels of courts since the inception of my appeal.

The evidences in all the submitted documents had shown that the DEFENDANT, Boston Retirement Board, have violated all the important elements stated in the Massachusetts Law Chapter 211 Section 3. The violations can be listed and shown in the followings with reference to the specific documents re-submitted here as attachments:

(1) Intentional and/or unintentional to conceal the admissible 20 pages of documents of evidences. These 20 pages of documents can be seen and read from CICIL DOCKET #SUCV2002-03854-F in the "PLEADING ON JANUARY 21, 2005 JUDMENT BY HONORABLE JUDGE CHRISTOPHER J. MUSE WITH PREVIOUSLY SUBMITTED DOCUMENTS THAT HAD BEEN OMITTED FROM THE 94 PAGES ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD BY ATTORNEY GENERAL THOMAS F. REILY."

(2) The DEFENDANT, Boston Retirement Board, had refused many times both from my repeated requests by phoning and by E-mailing for several weeks to participate and to prepare documents together with PLAINTIFF, Po Kee Wong, in response to Judge Jospeh M. Walker's request to prepare documents for NOTICE TO APPEAR FOR FINAL PRE-TRIAL CONFERENCE set on January 20, 2005 at 2:00 PM.

As a result of this violation by the DEFENDANT, Boston Retirement Board provided nothing to Judge Muse during the trial on January 20, 2005 in Court Room 2 – 12th Floor at 90 Devonshire Street, Boston, Massachusetts. In the above document (2), A BRIEF STATEMENT BY THE PETITIONER PO KEE WONG WHO EXPECTS THE FOLLOWING EVIDENCES TO SHOW:

1,. According to the General Laws of Massachusetts, Chapter 32., Retirement Systems and Pension Section 4-(1)-(d) Po Kee Wong should be allowed to buy back his services at Stone and Webster Engineering Corporation from 1976 to 2001 in the State of Massachusetts.

2. Section 4-(1)-(f) and Section 4-(1)-(f%1/2%p) for his services at University of Utah from 1959-1961; at California Institute of Technology from 1961-1965; at Stanford University from 1968-1970 and at Santa Clara University from January 4, 1971 to March 19, 1971.

3. Section 3-(4) ; Section 3-(4a) and Section 4-(1)-(p) all combined to allow for purchasing back up to 10 years of Services outside of Boston Public Schools. The petitioner Po Kee Wong should be allowed to buy back his creditable services.

4. Boston Retirement Board failed to reply the SUMMONS sent by Court that should have been answered within 20 days instead of 6 months. Therefore, judgment by default should have been taken against Boston Retirement Board for the relief demand in the COMPLAINT.

5. Petitioner Po Kee Wong's answer to Judge Grabau's final questions for buying 9 years and 5 months has never been answered by the Boston Retirement Board since the hearing from 12/01/2003.

6. Boston Retirement Board repeatedly ignored the NOTICE TO APPEAR FOR FINAL –TRIAL CONFERENCE sent from the court and failed to submit the required documents on January 20, 2005 at 2:00 PM.

(3) The Plaintiff Po Kee Wong obeys the General Laws of Massachusetts Part II, Title I, Chapter 211 Section 39 (one page) which is attached here together with:

1. A copy of the ANNEXED PAPER returned on February 7, 2006 from Superior Court Department of the Trial Court signed by L.B. and entered for docketing as Case No. 02-3854 as the proof that the Plaintiff respects and obeys the Law. 1page.

2. A copy of the June 22, 2005 letter from the Appeals Court Clerk's Office as the NOTICE OF DOCKET ENTRY as case 2005-J-0238. 1page.

3. A copy of the June 28, 2006 letter and NOTICE OF DOCKET ENTRY from Maura S. Doyle, Clerk, Supreme Judicial Court. 3pages.

Based on the above documents (1), (2) and (3) being submitted to you for your re-consideration of your judgment to provide relief to the plaintiff according to the law will be gratefully appreciated by all other educators under similar situations.

Respectfully submitted by
Signature signed by

Po Kee Wong, Pro Se Plaintiff, for Case SJ-2006-0041
Tel: 301-585-3453
pokwong@verizon.net

With copies served to:
Edward McKenna, Esquire
Juliana deHann Rice, Assistant Attorney General

Enclosures:
Attachment No.(1) 33 pages.
Attachment No.(2) 15 pages.
Attachment No.(3) 6 pages.

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS
SUPPFOLK SUPERIOR COURT

CIVIL DOCKET # **SUCV2002-03854-F**

PO KEE WONG

V.

BOSTON RETIRMENT BOARD ET AL

PLEADING ON JANUARY 21, 2005 JUDGMENT BY HONORABLE JUDGE CHRISTOPHER J. MUSE
WITH
PREVIOUSLY SUBMITTED DOCUMENTS THAT HAD BEEN OMITTED FROM THE 94 PAGES ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD
BY
ATTORNEY GENERAL THOMAS F. REILLY

SUBMITTED BY
PO KEE WONG, Pro Se Plain tiff
2413 Spencer Road, Silver Spring, Maryland 20910-2344
USA
Telephone: 301-585-3453
E-mail: pokwong@verizon.net

This appeal is the same document No.(1) listed in the Appeal to Supreme Justice Sosman as shown above. It contains 33 pages of documents. The most important one that should be read is my E-mail on Monday, February 14, 2005 11:59 AM sent to the court as shown in the followings:

From: pokwong@rcn.com
To: conley_m@jud.state.ma.us;walsh_t@jud.state.ma.us
Cc: Juliana.Rice@ago.ma.us;emckenna615@comcast.net;pokwong@rcn.com
Sent: Monday, February 14, 2005 11:59AM
Subject: (1) Acknowledgement of receipt 4 pages of Court Judgment Document signed by Mr. Conley and Judge Muse ; (2) Submission of pleading documents to the Court EN Banc for Case 02-3854-F

Dear Mr. Conley and Mr. Walsh:

Please help to confirm with the following facts according to all the submitted documents having been sent to the court for the Case 02-3854-F and present them to the panel of Judges: Judge Muse; Judge Walker and Judge Grabau who have been involved in judging the case:

(1) My answer to Judge Grabau's question on 12/01/2003 with submitted documents had been done and served to all concerned parties.
(2) My answer to Judge Walker's NOTICE TO APPEAR FOR FINAL PRE-TRIAL CONFERENCE on 01/20/2005 with submissions of required DOCUMENTS in time at the Court and THE MEMORANDUM in the required format Acceptable by the Court had already been done and served to all concerned parties.
(3) My pleading to Judge Muse for the Deft Boston Retirement Board's motion and JUDGMENT BY THE COURT for a reversal JUDGMENT is now being submitted to the Panel of Judges for re-consideration and to all concerned parties.

Please help to point out to the attention of Judge Muse to examine my original submitted 20 pages of documents that had been filed with the Court and compare the detail features of the corresponding documents that also appeared in the ATTORNEY GENERAL'S 94 page ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD page by page in the followings:

94 page ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD	**20 page ORIGINAL SUBMITTED DOCUMENTS**
Page No. 89	page 1
Not included	page 2(Very important Proof of Nesson's violation of U.S.C. 18 Section 2071)
Not included	page 3(2nd page of the letter to Anthony E. Penski, Esquire, Chairman (CRAB)
Not included	Page 4 Carol E. Nesson's letter Dated:Jan.30, 2002
Not included	Page 5 Carol E. Nesson's Motion to dismiss the case
Not included	Page 6 Carol E. Nesson's **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**
Not included	page 7(A page of State Law)
Not included	page 8(A page of State Law)
Not included	page 9 (document from Utah)
Page 05	page 10 more detail
Page 13(2yr. teaching)	page 11(5 yr. teaching)
Documents from Caltech	

Not included	page 12 (Santa Clara Univ.)
Not included	page 13 (Caltech document)
Not included	page 14 (Caltech document)
Page 38	page 15
Page 39	page 16
Page 03 (Curran's original letter)	page 17 (Marked Curran letter by Wong)
Not included	18(A page of State Law)
Not included	19(A page of State Law)
Not included	20 (A page of State Law)

The JUDGMENT by judge Muse is based on the conclusions of Judithann Burke (DALA) and of Carol E. Nesson (BRB) that can be and should be corrected by this pleading based on 4(f) and 4(f%1/2%p) followed by 3(4A). The fact can be seen from page 1 to page 14 and from 15 to 20 of the 20 pages original submitted documents as shown in the above table

Please enter this signed E-mail of communication with the Court as a formal admissible document. It is bound into this pleading document for Judge Muse to re-consider the reversal of this case based on the correct M.G.L.

I look forward to hearing from the FINAL decision of this case from the PANEL of Judges again and/or going to file the REHEARING En Banc all the way up if necessary.

Respectfully submitted to the Court
Signature signed
Po Kee Wong, Pro Se Petitioner for Case #02-3854-F
2413 Spencer Road, Silver Spring, MD 20910-2344
Tel:301-585-3453 E-mail;pokwong@rcn.com

SUMMARY OF SYSTEMS RESEARCH COMPANY

Po Kee Wong, the Pro Se Petitioner of this **PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORAI, has planned, directed and implemented all operations of SYSTEMS RESEARCH COMPANY from 1976 to present. He has contributed in the invention of 6 granted and pending US BASIC PATENTS with international impacts in physics, mathematics, engineering and high technologies for educational, industrial and defense applications. He has recruited, selected, supervised and developed professional and support staff involved in diverse endeavors. He has presented and published high qualitative technical papers in AIAA, ASME, MAA, IFA professional meetings and conferences at regional, national and international level since 1965. He has established stature in the profession as members of ASME, AIAA, AMS, MAA, New York Academy of Sciences, ; having been cited in 12 published "Who's Who" biographies. He obtained the first Federal Government Contract for SYSTEMS RESEARCH COMPANY FROM DOT-TSC UNDER ORDER No. TS-15054 in 1978 responding to the solicitation of a program in collisions of structures and a test case of SYSTEMS RESEARCH COMPANY'S unsolicited proposal TSC-UP-77-27. He produced the major SYSTEMS RESEARCH COMPANY'S proposal entitled "Initiation of the Definition of Trajectory Solid Angle and its Influence on Classical, Quantum and Statistical Mechanics" January 17, 1979.United States Department of Energy Proposal No. P7900450. His first patent entitled "TRAJECTORY SOLID ANGLES' IMPACTS TO PHYSICS AND HIGH TECHLOGIES" was issued on January 28, 1992.**

After obtaining his first proprietarily owned patent No.5,084,232 (TRACTORY SOLID ANGLES) issued from USPTO in January 1992, many proposals have been written since then while he was also under the employment of Boston Public School as a teacher since 1979. Therefore, under this condition, Po Kee Wong had submitted many of his proprietarily owned proposals to many U.S. Federal Agencies for supports with proposed partnerships with the Boston Public Schools as well as with many other industries in the entire United States of America.

A few of those proposals communicated with the relevant Federal organizations and their contracting officers are submitted here to the U.S. Supreme Court as a starting point for tracking and auditing the account of Boston Public Schools that may also have been involved in using SYSTEMS RESEARCH COMPANY'S proprietarily owned patents in the proposed joint -partnership proposals.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIRFORCE
HEADQUARTERS ELECTRONIC SYSTEMS DIVISION (AFSC)
HANSCOM AIR FORCE BASE, MASSACHUSETTS 01731-5000

25 February 1992

Reply to: PKRC/Colin Gray/(617)-377-4019

Subject: Program Research & Development announcement (PRDA) PL/GPA 92-02
Title: Advanced Physics Global Spectral Model

To:
Systems Research Company
ATTN: Dr. Po Kee Wong
50 Bradley Street
Somerville, MA 02145

1. You are hereby notified that your proposal, submitted in response to the subject PRDA, has not been selected for funding.

2. Since your proposal was not selected, no further consideration can be given to your proposal at this time. We appreciate your interest in solving the problems addressed in the PRDA; however, your proposed solution is not presently suitable for our needs.

3. Any questions regarding this action should be addressed to:

ESD/PKRC (Colin Gray)
Bldg. 1520, 3rd Floor
Hanscom AFB, MA01731-5320

Signed with signature of
KAREN M. STONE, Contracting Officer
R&D and Advanced Projects Contracts
Deputy Chief of Staff for Contracting

---

21 April 1994
MEMORANDUM TO ;
SYSTEMS ERSEARCH COMPANY (SRC)
50 Bradley street, Somerville, MA 02145-2924
ATTN: Po Kee Wong

FROM:
ESC/PKRC (Karen M. Stone/(617) 377-5914)
104 Braksdale Street
Hanscom AFB, MA 01731

SUBJECT:
Request Information about PRDA PL/GPA 92-02
-ACTION MEMORANDUM-

REFERENCE:
SRC letter dated 19APR94, same subject.

1. Per your request paragragraph (1) the following information is provided regarding the successful Offeror under subject PRDA:
Contract Number: F19628-92-C-0092
Contractor: Atmospheric & Environmental Research Inc.
ADDRESS:840 Memorial Drive, Cambridge, MA 02139
Telephone: 617-547-6207

2. The above stated contract is still active at this time, the cognizant Contracting Officer is Ms.Iris Durden, 617-377-2907. If you want to receive any documents in response to the above contract you must submit a request through our Freedom of INFORMATION Office. Your request must state you are requesting information under the Freedom of Information Act. Therefore you must state exactly what documents (s) you want copies of regarding Contract number F19628-92-C-0092. The address of of our FOIA office is as follows:

647 SPTG/IMDF
9 Eglin Street
Hanscom AFB, MA 01731-2109
ATTN: FOIA Office Telephone: 617-377-4320

Signed with signature
KAREN M. STONE
Contracting Officer
R&D Contracting Division
Directorate of Contracting

FILED
NOV 7 - 2007
OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

07-208

In The

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

PO KEE WONG, Pro Se – PETITIONER
VS
BOSTON RETIRMENT BOARD
MA SC Number: SJC 09858

Petition for a Writ of Certiorari to Supreme Judicial Court for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts in re: Case No.SJ-2006-0041and Case No.02-3854-F at Suffolk Superior Court According to U.S. Federal Supreme Court Rule 44.2 for a Petition for Rehearing of a Writ of Certiorari

PETITION FOR REHEARING OF A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

On November 6, 2007
Submitted by
PO KEE WONG, Pro Se-PETITIONER
2413 Spencer Road, Silver, Maryland 20910-2344
Tel: 301-585-3453; e-MAIL:
POKWONG@VERIZON.NET

CERTIFICATE

I certify pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 44.2 that this petition for rehearing is restricted to intervening circumstances of a substantial or controlling effect or to other substantial grounds not previously presented, and that it is presented in good faith and not for delay.

Respectfully submitted to the United States Supreme Court by:



Po Kee Wong, Pro Se Petitioner
2413 Spencer Road
Silver Spring, Maryland 20910-2344 USA
Telephone: 301-585-3453
E-mail: pokwong@verizon.net

November 6, 2007

TABLE OF CONTENTS

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION FOR REHEARING: from page No. 1 to page No.8

Reason No. 1: Intervening circumstances from documents of two related Supreme Court Case 06-1705 and Case 07-209:
From page 1 to page 2 of this Petition of Rehearing..

Reason No. 2: Grounds not previously presented: from page 2 to page 8 of this Petition of Rehearing.

REFERENCES: page 9

CONCLUSION: page 10

CERTIFICATE: page I

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION FOR REHEARING

1. The Court should consider and grant this Petition for Rehearing based on the intervening circumstances of documents submitted to the Court both for Case 06-1705 and for Case 07-209 having been submitted to the Clerk's Office of the Court on September 18, 2007. The contents of the submission are being copied in the followings:
Subject: Filing and Service of documents from various FOIA Offices of U.S. Government according to Supreme Court Rule 29.1.
Dear Mr. Suter:
Please help to enter the following attached documents requested from various FOIA Offices of U.S. Government for Supreme Court Case 07-209:
(1) 2 pages of documents from Michael A. West, Esq.'s September 13, 2007 letter.
(2) 2 pages of my July 25, 2007 at 2:41 PM E-mail to FOIA Offices and News Media.
(3) 1 page of PI Information Summary from National Science Foundation FOIA Office.
(4) 2 pages of PI Information Summary from Volpe Center of DOT,
(5) 3 pages of my communication with FAA of DOT.
(6)3 pages of PI Information from DOE.
(7) 7 pages of pi information Summary from nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC).
(8) 13 pages of PI Information Summary from NASA I-218 Case.

(9) 13 pages of communication with IRS and DOD; NASA and Education Department (ED);
Linda Darby's September 13, 2007 letter is also attached for joint investigations with IRS in relevance to NASA I-218 Case and with request for a complete PI Summary Information Report from all those Offices is in progress.

PART I-- 15 PAGES of an article. "IMPACTS FROM NEW SOLUTIONS OF OLD PROBLEMS IN MATHEMATICAL AND EXPERIMENTAL SCIENCES."

PART II. – 20 pages entitled "REQUEST REVIEW FROM MEMBERS OF CSTB OF NATIONAL ACADEMISES."

Both PART I and PART II. are open technical discussions by qualified mathematicians and computer scientists on the subject matter directly related to the patent application number 08/980,657.
Respectfully submitted by
Signature of Po Kee Wong
Pro Se petitioner for Case 07-209 and Case 06-1705

2. The Court should consider and grant this Petition for Rehearing based on grounds not previous presented as had been submitted and shown in many of the submitted documents in Reason Number 1.
In particular, please compare the 20 pages of originally submitted documents with the

94 pages ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD as they have been shown on page 14a and page15a in the booklet PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI for case 07-209. The clear comparison can be re-iterated again and shown in the February 14, 2005 11:59 AM E-mail to Conley_mjud.state.ma;walsh_t@jud.state.ma.us;Juliana.Rice@ago.ma.ma.us;emckenna615@comcast.net

Dear Mr. Conley and Mr. Walsh:

Please help me to confirm with the following facts according to the submitted documents having been sent to the court for the Case 02-3854-F and present them to the panel of Judges: Judge Muse; Judge Walker and Judge Grabau who have been involved in judging the case:

(1) My answer to Judge Grabau's question on 12/01/2003 with submitted documents had been done and served to all concerned parties.

(2) My answer to Judge Walker's NOTICE TO APPEAR FOR FINAL PRE-TRIAL CONFERENCE on 01/20/2005 with submissions of required DOCUMENTS in time at the Court and THE MEMORANDUM in the required format acceptable by the Court had already been done and served to all concerned parties.

(3) My pleading to Judge Muse for the Deft Boston Retirement Board's motion and JUDGMENT BY THE COURT for a reversal JUDMENT is now being submitted to the Panel of Judges for re-consideration and to all concerned parties.

Please help to point out to the attention of Judge Muse to examine my original submitted 20 pages of documents that had been filed with the Court and compare the detail features of the corresponding

Documents that also appeared in the ATTORNEY GENERAL'S 94 pages ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD page by page in the followings:

94 PAGES ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD BY REILLY & RICE	20 PAGES ORIGINAL SUBMITTED DOCUMENTS BY PO KEE WONG
Page 89	page 1
Not included	page 2
Not included	page 3
Not included	page 4
Not included	page 5
Not included	page 6
Not included	page 7
Not included	page 8
Not included	page 9
Page 05	page 10 more details
Page 13 (2 yr teaching)	page 11 (5 yr teaching)
Not included	page 12
Not included	page 13
Not included	page 14
Page 38	page 15
Page 39	page 16
Page 03 (unmarked)	page 17 (marked)
Not included	page 18
Not included	page 19(4A) underlined
Not included	page 20

The JUDGMENT by judge Muse is based on the conclusions of Judithann Burke (DALA) and of CAROL E. Nesson (BRB) that can be and should be corrected by this pleading based on 4(f) and

(f%p1/2%p) followed by 3(4A). The fact can be seen from page 1 to page 14 and from 15 to 20 of the 20 pages original submitted documents as shown in the above table.
Please enter this signed-Email of communication with the Court as a formal admissible document. It is bound into this pleading document for Judge Muse to re-consider the reversal of this case based on the correct M.G.L.
I look forward to hearing from the FINAL decision of this case from the PANEL of Judges again and/ or going to file for the REHEARING En Banc all the way up if necessary.

Respectfully submitted to the Court
Signature signed
Po Kee Wong, Pro Se Petitioner for case # 02-3854-F
2413 Spencer Road, Silver Spring, Maryland 20910-2344
Telephone: 301-585-3453
pokwong@rcn.com
Now pokwong@verizon.net

The above table should be used by the U.S. Federal Supreme Court Justices to check over page by page of the contents of a newly submitted document composed of the Attachment No.(1)- 33 pages; Attachment No.(2)- 15 pages and Attachment No.(3)- 6 pages in my July 1, 2006 PLEADING to Massachusetts Supreme Justice Sosman. All the reasons pleading to her should be examined by the U.S. Federal Supreme Court Justices as shown:

Dear honorable Supreme Justice Sosman:

This is pleading to you to reconsider your initial judgment of the case based on the following documents with facts that had been submitted and accepted for docketing by all three levels of courts since the inception of my appeal.
The evidences in all the submitted documents had shown that the DEFENDANT, Boston Retirement board, has violated all the important elements stated in the Massachusetts Law Chapter 211 Section 3. The violations can be listed and shown in the followings with reference to the specific documents re-submitted here as attachment No. (1)-33 pages; Attachment No. (2)-15 pages and Attachment No. (3)-6 pages:

(1) Intentional and/or unintentional to conceal the admissible 20 pages of documents of evidences. These 20 pages of documents can be seen and read from CIVIL DOCKET #SUCV2002-03854-F in the "PLEADING ON JANUARY 21, 2005 JUDGMENT BY HONORABLE JUDGE CHRISTOPHER J. MUSE WITH PREVIOUSLY SUBMITTED DOCUMENTS THAT HAD BEEN OMITTED FROM THE 94 PAGES ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD BY ATTORNEY GENERAL THOMAS F.REILLY."

(2) The DEFENDANT, Boston Retirement board, had refused many times both from my repeated requests by phoning and by E-mailing for several weeks to participate and to prepare documents together with PLAINTIFF, Po Kee Wong, in

response to Judge Joseph . M. Walker's request to prepare documents for NOTICE TO APPEAR FOR FINAL PRE-TRIAL CONFERENCE set on January 20, 2005 at 2:00 PM.

As a result of this violation by the DEFENDANT, Boston Retirement Board provided nothing to Judge Muse during the trial on January 20, 2005 in Court Room 2-12th Floor at 90 Devonshire Street, Boston, Massachusetts. In the above document (2), A BRIEF STATEMENT BY THE PETITIONER PO KEE WONG WHO EXPECTS THE FOLLOWING EVIDENCES TO SHOW:

1. According to the General Laws of Massachusetts, Chapter 32. Retirement Systems and Pension Section 4-(1)-(d) Po Kee Wong should be allowed to buy back his services at Stone and Webster Engineering Corporation from 2/25/74 to 2/4/75in the State of Massachusetts.
2. Section 4-(1)-(f) and Section 4-(1)-(f%p1/2%p) for his services at University of Utah from 1959-1961; at California Institute of Technology from 1961-1965; at Stanford University from 1968-1970 and at Santa Clara University from January 4, 1971 to March 19, 1971.
3. Section 3-(4);Section 3-(4A) and Section 4-(1)-(p) all combined to allow for purchasing back up to 10 years of services outside of Boston public Schools. The petitioner Po Kee Wong should be allowed to buy his creditable services.
4. Boston retirement Board failed to reply the SUMMONS sent by Court that should have been answered within 20 days instead of 6 months. Therefore, judgment by default should have been

taken against Boston Retirement Board for the relief demand in the COMPLAINT.
5. Petitioner Po Kee Wong's answer to Judge Grabau's final questions for buying back 9 years and 5 months has never been answered by the Boston Retirement board since the hearing from 12/01/2003.
6. Boston Retirement board repeatedly ignored the NOTICE TO APPEAR FOR FINAL-TRIAL CONFERENCE sent from the court and failed to submit the required documents on January 20, 2005 at 2:00 PM.

(3) The Plaintiff Po Kee Wong obeys the General Laws of Massachusetts Part II, title I, chapter 211 Section 39 (one page) which is attached here together with:
1. A copy of the ANNEXED PAPER returned on February 7, 2006 from Superior Court Department of the Trial court signed by L.B. and entered for docketing as Case No. 02-3854 as the proof that the Plaintiff respects and obeys the Law. 1 page.
2. A copy of the June 22, 2005 letter from the Appeals Court clerk's Office as the NOTICE OF DOCKET ENTRY as case 2005-J-0238. 1page.
3. A copy of the June 28, 2006 letter and NOTICE OF DOCKET ENTRY from Maura S. Doyle, Clerk, Supreme Judicial Court. 3pages.
Based on the above documents (1), (2) and (3) being submitted to you for your re-consideration of your judgment to provide relief to the plaintiff according to the law will be gratefully appreciated by all other educators under similar situations.
Respectfully submitted and signed by Po Kee Wong

REFERENCES

[1] Supreme Court Document 06-1705 by Po Kee Wong
[2] Supreme Court Document 07-209 by Po Kee Wong.
[3] Supreme Court Document 06-1324 by Po Kee Wong.
[4] Supreme Court Document 03-1322 by Po Kee Wong
[5] Supreme Court Document 03-1227 by Po Kee Wong
[6] USPTO patent application serial number: 08/980,657 by PO KEE WONG
[7] USPTO document entitled "BRIEF AND SUPPLEMENTAL APPENDIX FOR APPELLE DIRECTOR OF THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADMARK OFFICE "by John M. Whealan; James R. Hughes; Joseph G. Piccolo Dated: June 3, 2003
[8] COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS Civil Action No. 02-3854-F ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD by Thomas F. Reilly and Juliana deHaan Rice, Assistant Attorney General, Dated ; November 12,2003
[9] Documents submitted for PETITION FOR REHEARING OF A WRIT OF CERTIORARI for case 07-209 by Po Kee Wong, November 6, 2007
[10] PETITION FOR REHEARING OF AN EXTRAORDINARY WRIT OF MANDAMUS for case 06-1705 by Po Kee Wong October 23, 2007
[11] PETITION FOR REHEARING OF A WRIT OF CERTIORARI for case 07-209 by Po Kee Wong November 6, 2007

CONCLUSION

Based on the comparison of documents No.(1)-33 pages; No.(2)-15 pages; No.(3)-6pages listed in reference [8] and reference [9], the evidences have shown that the counsel of Boston Retirement Board had construed in violation of U.S.C. 18 Section 2071 with all the questions and reasons I;II;III;IV asked in Reference [2], the U.S. Federal Supreme Court should grant the relief for:

(1) Allowing Po Kee Wong to buy back 9 years and 5 months' time for his retirement benefits from the retirement board of the City of Boston according to the Massachusetts Retirement Law Section 3-(4); Section 3-(4A) and Section 4-(1)-(p).

(2) Auditing the account of the city of Boston specifically involved with Po Kee Wong's proposals having been submitted to the various U.S. Federal governmental agencies for supports with collaborations of Boston public Schools as a proposal partner.

(3) Asking the Treasury Inspector General to make a joint investigation with GAO and with the Solicitor General to clarify the corporate tax issues with all the FOIA documents submitted from various agencies having been and/or to be submitted to the U.S. Supreme Court. The petitioner Po Kee Wong is entitled for compensation for whoever has been using his proprietarily owned patents and proposals in obtaining the federal money supports before he should be charged for owing IRS corporate tax.